

2119
42
A Proper
ANSWER

To a Late
Abusive Pamphlet

Entitled, The
Winchester CONVERTS,

IN A
LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By Benjamin Hoadly.

By a Member of the University.

Answer not a Fool According to his Folly, lest thou also be like unto Him.

Answer a Fool according to his Folly, lest he be Wise in his own Conceit. *Prov. 26.*
v. 4, 5.

OXFORD:

Printed by Leon. Lichfield, for Anthony Peisley, and
Sold by J. J. and P. Knapton in Ludgate-Street,
W. Meadows in Cornhill, and A. Dod near Temple-
Bar. LONDON. 1735.

Price One Shilling

127

A. Probert

ANSWER

To a Late

Abusive Pamphlet

Entitled, The

Winchester CONVERTS

IN A

LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By a Member of the University.

Answer not a Fool, according to his fol-
ly, lest thou also be like unto him.
Answer a Fool according to his folly, lest
he be wise in his own conceit. Prov. 26.

OXFORD:

Printed by J. Innes for Anthony Wilson and
J. and F. Knapton in Long-street
near St. Dunstons Church and a Druggist.

A

Proper ANSWER &c.

Rev'd SIR,

THE World has lately been favour'd with a very Necessary and Useful Work: *A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* This Discourse has generally been attributed to a Right Reverend Prelate, Who has been long the Glory, and the Envy, of our Church: Whither He be *really* the Author of it, I shall not take upon *me*, to determine: But of *This* I am sure, that It is a Labour truly worthy of so Great a Man:—The Manifest Design of it being,—to explain an Important Point of Religion, which has been very much mistaken;—To shew the Real Nature, and the True End of the Eucharist;—to remove the false Confidences, that have been plac'd in it; and to guard against the many Superstitious Notions, that have been entertain'd about it. This Discourse has met exactly

A

with

with the Treatment, that was expected ; It has been receiv'd *differently*, according to the *different* Inclinations and Perswasions of its Readers. Men of Real Piety and Learning, have found, a *Real* and *Reasonable* Satisfaction, from it. The *Superstitious*, Who will always look upon Their Follies as Sacred, have declared themselves greatly offended at it, and have declaim'd against it, with no small degree of Clamour and Abuse. You, Sir, are the only Person, that has been pleas'd to make your self *Merry* with it. Neither are we to wonder, if the same Subject, which shall be treated of Superstitiously by a Bigot, should be handled Ridiculously by a Buffoon. Every Man has His *Own* Way of Thinking, and Writing : But whether *Every* Way be proper, for treating the Important Truths of Religion, is a Point which shall be examin'd in its turn. At present, Sir, I shall follow you in your *Own* way, and before I make any Reflections upon the Weakness, as well as Uncharitableness of your Performance, I shall consider a little, that most Droll-Dialogue, by which we are introduc'd to your more serious Remarks.

According therefore to your own most elegant Expression: *Let us begin from the*
be-

beginning (p. 4) Let us consider, who the Persons are, of Whom this most Curious Conversation-piece is compos'd. The First of them is one Mr. *Oldways*, a Gentleman in the main, very Serious, and Orthodox, but Who, throughout the whole first Dialogue, is just as *Odd* and *Comical* as His Companion. But we are to look upon Him, as Sneering with a very Grave Face, and concealing His real Sentiments, from the Gentleman He converses with. So far the Character agrees exactly with the Person, to whom This Extraordinary Piece has been attributed. But there is another Part of Mr. *Oldways's* Character, which has Puzzled the World very much: and That is, where 'tis declar'd, that He has made *Divinity* His *Constant Study*. (p. 19.) Now 'tis Notorious, that the Gentleman, Who is commonly reputed to be the Author of these Dialogues, turn'd Himself *very late* to the Study of Divinity. That he had try'd his Fortune in every Place, and almost every Way, before he set up for a Divine, That he had most Unsuccessfully apply'd himself to the Law, and been driven from the *Bar*, for many Years, before He took *Sanctuary* in the Church, and that he was *hired*, at almost the *Last*

A 2 Hour,

Hour, into the Vineyard. These Circumstances make it a little Uncertain, whether This Performance is really to be given, to the Gentleman, to whom it has been attributed? Unless we suppose, that He can change His Character, as often, as He has done His Name.

The other Person, who has a share in This Conversation, is a *very simple* Gentleman indeed; at the same time, both Pert, and Dull. Pleasant without Wit, Confident at first, without the Appearance of an Argument, and at last Convinced without a Reason. This is the Sort of Man whom Mr. *Old-Fashion* has chosen to *Play* off, The Creature that He is to Confute, the Wretch that He Triumphs over. As to His Raillery, there is something in it so Cold and Insipid, that no one but Mr. *Old-Fashion* would have let Him continue it so long. How Absurd and Nonsensical is that Project, of placing half a Dozen People at a Table, so, that it is Impossible, but they must have the Cup given to every one of them, *First?* (p. 11.) much of the same sort is that Low Conceit, of carrying a Napkin to Church, for fear of daubing one's Fingers at the Communion. (p. 10.) But the standing *Joke* throughout

out the whole Dialogue, is That of *Drinking*. This is carried from the Church, to the Tavern, and from the Tavern, to the Gin-Shop. With this the Author is so much pleas'd, that He puts it in a Hundred Ridiculous Lights; and the whole Wit of the Dialogue turns upon a *Point*, which has been the *Fest* of the *Prophane*, ever since the Institution of the Sacrament. But I must tell you, Sir, What, the Thinking part of your Readers have complain'd of already, that This Kind of Burlesque, This manner of Confounding the Idea's of Drinking at the Lord's Supper, and at a Tavern, *tends manifestly*, not only to ridiculing the Account given us by the *Author*, You would expose, but to the Subjecting, even the *Institution* itself to Contempt. 'Tis time therefore to be serious, and to shew, the Ill Consequences of so light a way of arguing on such a subject. That the Eating Bread and Drinking Wine is a *Necessary* part of this Holy Action, is What, I believe, every one Allows; that the *Author* of the *Account* (whom for distinction sake we will call Our Author) has made *no difference*, betwixt This Eating and Drinking, and an Ordinary Junket, and a Common Drink-

Drinking-bout, is *What*, No one, but Your self, would have had *Assurance* or *Partiality* enough, to have Asserted. However he may differ from Others, as to the Benefits annex'd to this Rite, yet He has asserted, over and over again, that It is to be perform'd, in *Remembrance of our Lord, as a Memorial of His Body broken, and Blood shed for us,* and as such, *to be distinguish'd from an Ordinary Meal, or Entertainment.* That Ridiculous Image therefore, of *taking a Whet in a Morning, and drinking a Health to all Absent Friends,* is just as Applicable, to the *Lord's Supper itself*, as to the *Account* given of it by our *Author*: a Man of a *Prophane* turn of Mind will apply all those light Expressions, as well and as properly to the Eucharist in its original Institution, as This Remarker has done to *What*, perhaps, he will call a *Winchester-Communion.* It may be said, that the Notion of common eating and drinking at an Entertainment, is not to be Confounded with the partaking of the Elements at the Lord's Supper: And that therefore, This Ridicule cannot *properly* affect that Holy Action. I say, neither can It *properly* affect the Account of it, as deliver'd to us by our Author, and
that

that for the *very same Reason*, because he has industriously distinguish'd *It* from an *Ordinary Meal*, and shewn plainly, that the *not doing this* was the Fault, for which *St. Paul* reprov'd the Corinthian Converts. But then the Question is, Whether that Ridicule, which has been so freely made use of on this occasion, may not make other People as Merry with the Sacrament, as the Remarker is with our Author's Account of it? To be as clear as possible, for I would willingly prove every thing that I shall object to this Writer. He has endeavour'd to shew, that the Sacrament, according to our Author's account of it (which many People may think the Best, and perhaps the only Rational one that ever was given) is no Better, than a *Club at a Tavern*, or a *Merry-meeting* in a *Gin-shop*; and does he think, that there are no Persons, who will make as Free with *His Communion*? The Action of Eating and Drinking is the Foundation of all his Drollery, *This is Necessary* to the Celebration of the Eucharist, even after his manner, which is therefore just as liable to the same *Ridiculous Mirth*. This he will say, is Confounding two very different Ideas.

I grant that it is: But what are all Addresses to the Imagination, but the great Means and Occasions of confounding our Idea's? Is this Gentleman yet a Stranger to that Sensible Observation of Mr. *Locke**, on the different Purposes, to which those Faculties of the Mind, The Judgment, and the Imagination, are generally employ'd? that as it is the Business of the one, to examine all our Idea's with Accuracy and Exactness, lest we should be led into Errors, by mistaking one Idea for Another: So 'tis the General Employment of the other, to find out some sort of *Resemblance* or *Similitude* in the *most distant* Idea's, and to *blend* them together so *Artfully*, that the *Difference* may not be discern'd, but we may *mistake* one for another. And can we depend upon this Picturesque Faculty of the Mind, that It will carry a *Droll Similitude*, or an *Idle Allusion*, no further, than we have a mind it should? When we have permitted the *free Exercise* of it, in *one* Case, will It not claim a sort of Right to Extend itself to *All Cases*, which shall seem Parallel to It? Can it be expected, that Men who have been taught to ridicule Eating and Drink,

* Essay on the *Understanding*, lib. 2. c. 11.

ing in Remembrance of their Saviour, in order to Expose one Particular Author, should be perswaded to think of it more seriously, and to talk of it more decently, when It is proposed to them, by a less serious and less sufficient Author? Is a Man to supply the *Youth* of the *Univer-*
sity, with *Fests* upon the *Sacrament*, and then to imagine, that they will use Them only as *He* shall direct them, only against the *Author* whom he would Abuse, and not against the *Institution* itself? Such a Conduct in a Clergyman may, I am sure, have a very bad Effect upon Younger Minds, and if it does not give them a very loose way of thinking of this Sacrament, It must be owing rather to their own good Dispositions, than to *Any* in the Writer.

If to this it shall be said. That we have no reason to apprehend such ill Consequences, from any Performance of this Writer, that he is *too well known* to Mankind, to be able to *Impose* upon them, that no one ever suspected Him to be in Earnest, or Listen'd to him with any other design, than That of being *Di-*
verted, that This *same Gentleman*, has lately treated of the Joys of Heaven, and the Terrors of Hell, in the same *Ludicrous*
B
manner,

manner, with which he has handled the Doctrine of the Sacrament: and can any one think, that *such a Man*, can be *Serious*, or in *Earnest*, upon any subject? For fear of being thought too Severe I will admit of this very Odd Excuse. I will allow so Diverting a Divine, the Merry *Andrew's* privilege, of Saying *in His way*, Whatever he has a mind to. But then I ask, why will such a Creature pretend to *Knowledge*, *Criticism*, and *Reason*? Why will he wear a *Solemn Face*, with a *Fools-Cap*? and so Unnaturally joyn the *Doctor*, with the Droll? If we pardon his being *Ridiculous* in the *first* Dialogue, can we forgive, his being *Unjust* and *Uncharitable*, in the Second? If we allow Our selves, to *laugh*, at the Impertinence of Him and his Companion, at their first meeting, We must not pass over the False Reasonings, The Ill-natur'd Inferences, the Scurrilous Abuse, and the most Impudent Reflections of his Second-day's Conversation, which we now come to Examine.

This Dialogue has very little to do with the Doctrine of the Sacrament, and consists chiefly, if not entirely, of Personal Abuse against our Author. After the First Morning Compliments are over, which

which are the only Points in which the Remarker shews Himself a *Gentleman*; He begins the Conversation, with pointing out Our Author more directly, and then endeavours to prove, that He can be *No Christian*. I shall not examine the Points, whereby the Truth and Sincerity of any Man's being a Christian, is, according to him, to be try'd; nor the Arguments which he brings from Scripture to prove Them. I shall only observe, that the *Standard* of his Faith seems to be, the *Athanasian Creed*, and his Body of Divinity, Nothing more than *Ellis* upon the *Articles*.

But in support of this Heavy Charge against Our Author, Mr. *Old-fashion* attempts to shew, in the First Place, That he does not *believe the Divinity of our Saviour*. This he proves in a very Extraordinary Manner by observing, that He no where asserts it. (p. 27.) What the Divinity of Christ has to do with a Discourse on the Sacrament, I shall never be able to understand. Is an Author oblig'd when he is writing upon one Point of Religion, to speak upon *All*? And is He to be presum'd to disbelieve, whatever He does not mention? Perhaps it may be said, that as we commemorate chiefly

the *Sufferings* of our Lord, in the Eucharist, it is more proper for us to remember Him as *Man*, than as *God*. But there is no occasion for this Plea, or even for observing, that the Mentioning our Saviour's Divinity, would have been foreign to our Author's Purpose. The whole Form and Manner of the Remarker's Reasoning is to be denied and rejected; and his Conclusion is as Illogical, as it is Uncharitable. The drawing distant and unforeseen Consequences from an Author's Words, has generally been look'd upon as an unfair Way of Reasoning, but the making Ill-natur'd Inferences, from What a Man has NOT said, is What any One, who calls himself a Scholar, and professes himself a Clergy-man, should be asham'd of.

Suppose any one should infer, that this Writer did not believe the Truth of Christianity, because he does not attend His Parish, and instruct them in the Duties of it, Would not this be just as *Fair* a Way of proving Him an *Infidel*, as He has taken of shewing our Author to be a *Socinian*! I wonder that This Ingenious Gentleman did not endeavour to prove our Author to be a *Jacobite*; a Man of His Sagacity might have observ'd, that
in

in one part of his Devotions, He has pray'd for the King, without mentioning His Majesty KING GEORGE, all those Arguments therefore of—*its being proper --of His being led to it by what He was speaking on—of its being reasonably expected from Him*—might have been brought, to have prov'd Somewhat more from This *Omission*, than has been hitherto suspected of Him. Surely This is a Way of Arguing by Which Heresy, Infidelity, Popery, or Whatever you have a mind to, may be fix'd upon any Man. The only Argument that is brought in defence of this Manner of condemning a Man, is a Quotation from a *London Journal*, which I dare say the Remarker Himself looks upon as Idle and Fallacious. He therefore goes on at p. 30th, to draw near to what he calls a strict and positive proof, and bids us, take our Author's *own Words*, for his denying the Divinity of Christ: The place he produces is this, viz. p. 124. of the Devotions, Where Addressing Himself to God the Father, he says 'Accept
' of this Sincere profession of my Faith in
' thee, the only True God, and in Jesus
' Christ whom thou hast sent. The Reflection made upon it by the Remarker is This—' That the Words, *whom Thou hast*
' sent

‘*sent*, being added after he had declar’d
 ‘the *Father* to be the *only true* God, must
 ‘*Necessarily* signify that he Believ’d in
 ‘Christ, only, as a Divine Prophet, or
 ‘Teacher, and not as God himself. I
 would ask This Gentleman, whether he
 ever read the New Testament, or how
 many years ago it may be since he look’d
 into it. I would desire Him to turn to
 it once more, and consult the Gospel of
 St. *John*, at the 17th Chapter and the 3d
verse: Where he will find, that the
 Words, He has been censuring, are the
very Words of our Saviour: His Re-
 flection therefore must be upon our Lord,
 and not upon our *Author*. Strange!
 that a *Christian* should be so severely re-
 flected upon, for *Praying* in the very
 Words of him, who *taught us to Pray*. I
 wish for the future, a Man may not be
 call’d a *Heretick*, for saying the *Lord’s*
Prayer. A great deal more may be said
 on this Occasion, but I shall spare the
 Gentleman, and Charitably impute it to
His Ignorance. This, Sir, is your first
 setting out against our Author, This is
 the Method, by which you prove your
 terrible Charge against Him.

Are These the *Things* you call *Argu-
 ments*? Are These the Qualifications,
 with

with which you set up for a Critick, and a Master of Reason? As Well might every Scribler in Religion, call himself a Divine; and Every *Occupier of Lodgings in a Hall* be styled a HEAD of a HOUSE. But I have promis'd to examine you, and must therefore go on.

As to all that Raillery that follows upon *Long Prayer*, I shall only observe, that This Writer seems to be very much afraid of Lengthning his Devotions, and very Averse to every thing, that shall look like to the Dissenters: I hope therefore, for the future, that He will remember, That the Presbyterians are as fond of *Long Sermons*, as they are of *Long Prayers*.

(Pag. 33. of the *Remarks*.) The Second Article of Accusation against our Author is, That he does *Not Believe the Necessity of Christ's Merits towards obtaining Salvation*. This he proves in his usual manner, by a most manifest Misrepresentation, and an uncharitable Inference from our Author's Words; At pag. 197. of the Preface to his Devotions, our Author is endeavouring to guard Men from an Error they are too apt to be guilty of: He therefore tells them, ' That he cannot suffer himself, to direct
' any

any Christians to ask Pardon of their
 Sins, upon the *bare* Confession of them,
 or to expect it, *merely* upon their en-
 treating Forgiveness for the Sake of Je-
 sus Christ: But has thought it agree-
 able to the Gospel, to make it their own
 Disposition and Act, to ask and expect
 Forgiveness, upon the Conditions *only*,
 of Forsaking their Sins, and the Amend-
 ment of their Lives. Any one, I
 should think, might look upon This as
Religious and *Christian* Advice: but our
 Remarker has found out in these words,
 an Intent of denying the Necessity of
 Christ's Merits, and teaching us to rely
 entirely on our own *good Works*. The
Foundation for This, is, our Author's
 directing Christians to ask for, and expect
 pardon of their Sins, on the Conditions
only of forsaking them and amending
 their lives. May not any one see that
 in this place the Word *only* is oppos'd,
 not to any Relyance upon the Merits of
 Christ, which indeed is not mention'd
 here, but only to the *bare* Confession of
 Sin, and the *merely* entreating forgiveness
 for the sake of Christ. 'Tis *Hard* to have
 an Author's words rack'd and tortur'd,
 to express a Meaning, Which was never
 intended; but 'tis still Harder, to have a
 Man

Man Censur'd and Condemn'd; merely for *not* saying, what another has a mind He should say, however *improper* it may be to the point, on which He is Speaking.

But the Remarker has *another* Objection to this Passage, He will not only make it Heresy, but Nonsense; and he is just as successful in one attempt, as the other. Surely the asking or Expecting Forgiveness may be very well said to be a Man's own Disposition or Act, but it seems the Nonsense lies, in *one* Man's talking, of *His making another* Man's Disposition or Action; but is there any thing more Common in all Languages, than to say, that we *make* a Man do, what we *Exhort, Instruct, or Teach* Him to do? if this be *Criticism*, 'tis making the Art appear still lower than ever to the World. But This is not to be a *Critick*, but a *Word-catcher*.

The next Objection to our Author is, that p. 34. He does not believe the Personality and Godhead of the Holy Ghost: This is prov'd just in the same Way, with the former Charge, by observing, that He is so *entirely silent* upon this Head, that His Readers may fairly Say to him as the Ephesian Converts did to St. Paul, *We have not so much as heard, whether*
C there

there be any Holy Ghost. Besides the Weakness and Insufficiency of this Argument, It happens to be absolutely False; our Author having more than once in his Forms of Devotion (*p. 212, and p. 248.*) pray'd for the Concurrence and Assistance of the Holy Spirit, towards our attaining Everlasting Life. And *This* the Remarkers has modesty enough to own, within 2 or 3 Pages of that place, where He says, there is not *one Syllable* in the Book, that looks that way.

The Greatest part of what follows upon *Grace*, is brought in, to no end or purpose, unless it be to introduce two Whimsical Stories, (One of which is no more to His purpose, than if He had told us any other Story out of his Brother *Penkethman's* Jest, unless He supposes, that his little French Lawyer did really speak, by an *Influx from the Deity.*)—Where indeed he is endeavouring to shew, that our Author has denied the Necessity of Divine Grace; He is guilty of a most gross Misrepresentation, and has deliver'd his *own* Comment as our Author's Words, He is represented by him as asserting, at *p. 154.* 'That all (Spiritual) Benefits 'receiv'd by Reasonable Creatures, must be receiv'd in a *Reasonable Way*, that is, 'in

‘in such a manner as they can fully *Understand* and *Account* for.—The Inference is plain—that as it is impossible for us to *Understand* the manner, in which the Holy Spirit operates upon us, we are not to expect or pray for his Assistance—Now as these words appear to us, Any one, who did not turn to the Book, would believe, that they *really* did belong to our Author; and think, that there were too Just Grounds for the Inference drawn, from them. But whoever will look into our Author’s Account of the Sacrament, will find, that he has explain’d himself in a *quite different* way, that he has shewn, what he means, by Reasonable Creatures receiving Impressions, in a *Reasonable Way*, *that is*, according to *Him*, in a manner, Consistent with the Nature of Moral and Free Agents, not as *Clock-work*, or *Machines*, to be acted upon by the Arbitrary force of a Superior Being; as he explains Himself in the Passage immediately following. How different does the sense of these words now appear, from what they were represented to be by the Remarker, who has been pleas’d to add an Exposition of his *own* Invention, and deliver it, as *the words* of our Author. The Malicious Inference

which was made from them, is entirely remov'd, by shewing them as they really are. But This perhaps is the least Misrepresentation, which we have to complain of from so Partial and Unjust a Hand. And yet after all this stuff, is poor Mr. *New-Fashion* obliged to Compliment his Friend, *as a very fair Disputant.* (p. 26.) and to own, that *He is satisfy'd.* (p. 40.) Nay he begins, *to be asham'd of the Book, and sorry that he had engag'd in the Defence of it.* But every body knows the Modern Method of Dialogue, 'tis, as an * Ingenious Author describes it, a game at *Hot-cockles*, where one Person lays down, on purpose to be *beat*: at present, it may put us in mind, of a Modest Disputation, betwixt a Modern Orator, and his Antagonist.

But to return to our Remarker. Having endeavour'd to prove that our Author is *no Christian*, His next attempt is to shew that he can be no true *Church-man*. But I pass over This, together with his *Civil Hints* to Him, to resign his Preferments; For surely he might have saved us this Trouble, unless he thinks that a man may be a very good *Churchman*, without being a *Christian*.

Our Author's sincerity as a *Christian*, and as a Member of the *Church of England*,

* Lord Shaftsbury.

has

has hitherto been impeach'd, the Business of the Remaining part of the Dialogue, is to shew, that he has neither Judgment, Learning, or Sagacity, (p. 44.) To prove this he produces and endeavours to expose our Author's Paraphrase on the 20th and 21st Verses of 1 Cor. 11: (p. 49.) The Absurdity he complains of is This, that our Author makes the Apostle, tell the *Corinthians*, that they did not receive the *Sacrament* worthily, because they had behav'd themselves indecently at the *Agape*. 'Where and when (Say's He according to this Exposition) do they 'behave so indecently? at that Feast to 'which they join the Lord's Supper. 'Pray observe 'Not while they are actually eating the Lord's Supper: But at 'that Feast which they meet at before the 'Lord's Supper. These words which he has mark'd as our Author's, and introduc'd with a particular, *pray observe*, I assert, are no where in the Book. Nay, so far is he from saying any thing like This, that he has directly told us the Contrary. At p. 76. He says expressly, that the *Corinthians* had been guilty of great and Criminal Indecencies at the *very time* of the Celebration. Nay, he has told us at Proposition the 14th expressly, and in Capitals,

pitals, that the whole Affair of eating and drinking UNWORTHILY, in St. *Paul's* sense, is confined to the frame of our Minds, and our Behaviour, AT the very time of our Performance of this Religious Duty. And yet the Remarker has the Confidence to say, that our Author introduces St. *Paul*, as reproving the Corinthians for the Indecency of their Behaviour, not at the *Lord's Supper*, but at the *Love Feast*, and makes their unworthy receiving consist, not in their deportment at the Lord's Table, but at *their own*. Which, says he, is contrary to what this Author has asserted in other Places of his Book, from whence he would prove him *Inconsistent with Himself*, p. 49. The Conduct of the Remarker in this Place is without Excuse, for I am satisfy'd he can *Read*, he must therefore have wilfully over look'd these Words, which so palpably contradict all that he has asserted. The whole of the Absurdity, which he here charges on our Author's Paraphrase, is founded on Words, which are entirely his *own*. But this is not, as I have shewn, the *only* place where He has inserted His own Comment as the Text of the Author he would abuse: surely this is something worse than Misrepresentation, I cannot but think

think that it, in some measure deserves, the name of Forgery. 'Tis true, that our Author in one part of his Paraphrase, introduces St. *Paul*, as reproofing the Corinthians, for their Uncharitableness, in excluding their poor Brethren, from that Feast, to which they join'd the Lord's Supper: And he very rightly observes, that the Apostle reproaches them with *two* Faults, the one of them was their not discerning the Lord's Body, but confounding the Eucharist with a Common Entertainment; the other was, their not admitting the whole Congregation to their Feast; these He distinguishes *Carefully*, throughout the whole Paraphrase, and declares manifestly, that their Unworthy Receiving consisted in the Former. Had our Remarker attended to this, he might have been instructed by the Comment, he has endeavour'd to explode; But having condemn'd our Author's Exposition on this Passage of St. *Paul*, he is so good, as to give us his *own*, which is indeed an Extraordinary one. I need only transcribe it, to expose it—It runs thus.

'When you come together into one place;
 '(This is not to eat the Lord's Supper)
 ' that I am speaking of, but the *Agapa*.)
 let me add another Parenthesis, (that
 This

This is not sense,) and yet Another, (that This is not English,) and now let us go on—‘For the Eating that I would ‘condemn in you is, where every one ‘taketh before other his own Supper; that is, the Rich, who bring store of provision along with them, eat it amongst themselves, and don’t let the Poor have any share of it, till after they have done with it, and can eat no longer; which eating they sometimes continue to very great Excess, (for as to *such* a manner of eating, at the Lord’s Supper, I know very well that can’t possible be done: the Establish’d *Rules* of the Church have settled that matter, and you must necessarily be all joint Partakers together, at one time) I should be glad to know, on what part of the Chapter, This Parenthesis is a Commentary, I know of none to which it can possibly refer, and I am sure, It makes St. *Paul* give a very weak Reason, why Rules can not be broken, *viz.* because they are made: it would be strange, if they should be broken before they are made. But to go on with our most acute Commentator, ‘He observes, p. 46. that ‘Hitherto, which is all that is contain’d ‘in those two Verses, nothing is said a-
bout the Sacrament, which is not mention’d

tion'd by the Apostle, till the Twenty-
third Verse, 'when he seems to bring it
'in as a *Pattern*, how they should behave
'themselves at the *Agapa*, by laying a
'*Stress* upon the Words *Break, Take, Eat,*
'*Drink*; or as St. *Matthew* expresses it,
'Drink you *All*, (which Words are Un-
luckily left out by the Apostle) signify-
'ing, that as our Saviour's Charity, and
'Benevolence, was Universal, that as He
'was desirous, that *All* Faithful and Re-
'ligious Christians, should be equally
'Partakers of the Benefits of His Body
'broken, and Blood shed upon the Cross,
'so they should take care, not to *appro-*
'*priate* to themselves, the Good Things
'of this Life, but make an equal Distri-
'bution of them amongst their poor Bre-
'thren, when they met together at their
'Common Feast of Charity.

This, Sir, is your most extraordinary
Exposition on this Place of St. *Paul*.
Let us examine It a little by the *Original*,
for I am sadly afraid, that you have look'd
no further than the English Translation.

Συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐν τὸ αὐτὸ, *when you*
come together into one place *, which last
Words may perhaps relate rather to an
Action than a Place, οὐκ ἔστι κλειστόν δειπνοῦ

* *Vid.* 1 Cor. 7. 5. where the same Words are used.

φαγῆν, the English of which, according to you, is, *I am not speaking about the Lord's Supper.* ἵνατος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον περιλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν. In the eating that I would condemn, every one taketh before other his own Supper, the Rich eat their Provisions by themselves; καὶ ὁς μὲν πινῶ, and the Poor have no share in it, till the Rich have done with it, and can eat no longer, ὁς δὲ μεθύνει, which *Eating* is sometimes continued to Excess. Let this Comment be compar'd with our Authors, and I leave any Man, who has common Sense, and understands Grammar, to determine, which is the Best, and most agreeable to the design of the Apostle. But you go on to observe, that hitherto *Nothing has been said* about the Lord's Supper. According to the plain meaning of the words of St. Paul, and the sense of all other Expositors, he has told his Disciples, that when they met together, it was in such a manner, as was not to eat the Lord's Supper *properly*, or as it *ought* to be eaten. But you say, the Sacrament is here mention'd only *occasionally*, and the Institution of it is repeated, and set before the Corinthians, as a *Pattern*, how they should behave themselves at the *Agape*. Strange! that St. Paul should instruct his

Dis-

Disciples, and *that* by a Divine Revelation, that when they eat their Suppers, they should take, eat, and drink. You'll say, that the force of the Argument lays in that Expression, drink you *All*, that as *All* our Saviour's Disciples partook of the last Supper, so *All* the Brethren, both Poor and Rich, should have shared in the *Agape*, or Feast of Charity. But here is the great Misfortune, that St. *Paul* has not mention'd a Word of This, upon which the whole Stress of the Argument lays. So that, *According to you*, St. *Paul* instructs his Followers, out of the Words of St. *Matthew*, which Words he either *forgot* or *neglected* to produce. Was there ever so Monstrous a Comment, so Ridiculous an Exposition; as I said before, why will This Man pretend to Reason—But Thus it will always be, when *Pickle-Herring* takes the place of the *Doctor*. Pray, Sir, let me beg you for the future, not to meddle with St. *Paul*—think of some other way of spending your time—write Ballads—talk about Discipline—curl your Wigg—but for God's sake, let alone the New Testament.

The next Objection to our Author's Character, is his small Acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History, and the Rites and

Customs of the Apostolick Age, p. 50. The only Instance given of This, is his supposing the *Agapæ* to be a Feast *preceding* the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, and not coming after it, as says this Remarker, it Certainly did in those days. To this I would answer, First, That whether the Love-Feast was held before, or after the Lord's Supper, is a Point of so little Importance, that it does not signify, which way it is determin'd; since not one of our Author's Arguments at all depends upon it. We may observe further, That this is a Point, on which the best and ablest Ecclesiastical Writers are divided, and speak with the greatest *Uncertainty*. The Learned *Suicerus* is of Opinion, with our Author, that the *Agapæ* preceded the Celebration of the Eucharist, in the Primitive Church; and thinks it may be prov'd, from this Chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Both *Daille* and *Estius* concur with Him in this Opinion: And the Worthy and Laborious Mr. *Bingham* (an Author, to be for ever Valu'd, and Reverenc'd in our Church) after having given the Arguments on both Sides, concludes with observing, that 'What seems most probable in this Case is, that 'in the Primitive Age, they observ'd *no* certain

certain Rule about this Matter, but had
 their Feast, sometimes before, sometimes
 after the Communion, as it appears to
 have been in some measure in the fol-
 lowing Age. *Lib. 15. c. 7.* It would
 have therefore been more *Modest*, in this
 Gentleman, not to have determin'd so
 peremptorily in a Point, which the Best
 Writers have spoken on with Reserve and
 Uncertainty. The Authority He brings
 from *Pliny*, seems not quite sufficient to
 His Purpose; for I believe, those Words,
Sacramento se in aliquod obstringere, will
 hardly signify, to receive the *Sacrament*;
 and I believe *Pliny* uses the Word *Sacra-*
mentum, rather in a *Classical* and *Military*,
 than in a Religious or Ecclesiastical Sense.
 But This, as I observ'd before, is a Point
 of so much Uncertainty, and so little Im-
 portance, that an Author may surely be
 mistaken in it, without being reflected
 upon, for his *Ignorance* in Ecclesiastical
 Antiquity. The Remarker is so obliging
 as to ask his Friend, if He will please to
 take *two or three* more Instances of the
 like Nature. I dare say, if they had
 been produc'd, they would have been of
 the like Nature: But He is so good, as
 to save, both Himself and Us the trouble.
 And concludes this Dialogue with decla-
 ring

ring, that He is satisfy'd, that our Author is not only an *Insincere Man*, but a *worse Critick*, and *less Judicious Writer*, than He took Him to be.

Mr. *New-fashion* begins the Third Dialogue with acquainting His Friend with a *most convincing Proof*, that He has met with, 'Of the very Bad Consequences of 'the Fundamental Doctrine of this Book 'of ours, and since he finds the Consequences of the Doctrine to be so bad, 'he begins to suspect that the Doctrine, 'it self must be so. This *most Convincing proof* that he has met with, appears to be nothing else, but an *Idle Story*, of a Rakish Young Fellow in a Coffee-House, who thought himself at liberty, to cut-off the Waiters Ears, merely because it was not forbidden by the Sixth Commandment. And he is made to defend this Notion (p. 54.) from the new Book of the *Sacrament*; which assures us, that we must not think above what is *Written*, of that which can receive its Value, only from what is *Written*: and from hence is inferr'd, the Inconvenience and Danger of sticking to the Letter of the Law (p. 53.) But I would ask Mr. *Old-fashion*, whether he thinks the whole Obligation of this Command, of not maiming a Man,

de-

depends entirely upon its being *Written*, or whether there be not Antecedent Unfitness in such an Action, Prior even to the Prohibition of it. What Parallel can there Possibly be, betwixt, our Causelessly Wounding a Man, and our not complying with an Institution further, than we are strictly Commanded by the Author and Appointer of it? The *Fallacy* therefore lies here, that He has manifestly confounded a Negative Precept restraining us from an Act of Immorality, with a *Positive Duty*; Which surely can require our Obedience no further, than it is enjoyn'd us, by the Words of him alone who made it a *Duty*. Both his Argument and his Story are therefore Nothing to the Purpose. In Return for this Story of his, I could if I thought proper, tell Him a *Thousand* of the Inconvenience, Burthen, and Scandal, that have been brought upon Religion, by Men's not *adhering* to what has been *Written*, and by their *adding* their own Inventions, to the Word and Ordinance of God. This, I am perswaded, has been the great Source of Corruptions in the Church, and one main Cause of the Disbelief of Christianity.

But I hasten to consider what this Gentleman

tleman has advanc'd against what, *He calls*, the Doctrines of the Book. He has hitherto attack'd our Author with nothing, but *Ridicule*, and Personal *Abuse*: He now comes, for about a Dozen Pages in the Last Part of His Remarks, to object to some Positions, *said* to be laid down by our Author, in Relation to this Sacrament. He says, that the Nature of the Conference, will not permit His Arguments to be Long, and I promise Him, that my Answers shall be as Short, as His Objections. At p. 58. He draws up Five Positions, which He says our Author concludes not to be Necessary for us to believe or practice, because they are not declar'd to us in any Passages of the New Testament. The First of these is, *That* of a Necessary Consecration of the Elements of the Lord's Supper by a Priest. This He says, our Author denies, as not being warranted by Scripture. *This* is what *no where appears* from any thing that Our Author has said: But however, in *His* Sense of Consecration, I believe we may grant It Him, and let us see how He proves the Necessity of this Consecration from the New Testament. Pag. 59. He cries out against our Author's *Sincerity*, for doubting whether our Saviour may

may be properly said to have Blessed the *Bread* when He brake it; to satisfy Him therefore we will grant Him *This* too, nay we will allow Him that Christ Blessed the Cup also, and if he pleases *ευχαριστῆν* shall signify the same with *εὐλογεῖν*. And yet I cannot see how He will prove the Necessity of His Consecration from hence. For 'tis the constant Opinion of the best Criticks, on the New Testament, that *εὐλογεῖν τι*, and *εὐλογεῖν τῷ Θεῷ ὑπὲρ τίνος*, to bless a Thing, and to bless God over it, or for it, signify the same. Thus in the Miracle of the Loaves and the Fishes, at the 8th Chapter of St. *Mark*, at the 6th Verse, we are told, that our Saviour *λαβὼν τὸς ἄρτους, εὐχαριστήσας ἔλασεν*; thus again at the 9th Chap. of St. *Luke*, at the 16th Verse, *λαβὼν δὲ τὸς ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀνέβλεψας εἰς τὸ οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς*. To the same purpose, and in the same words, we read at the 14th Chapter of St. *Matthew*, at the 19th Verse. These Places you must own are exactly parallel in Expression, to that Passage which you produce out of St. *Mark*, and I leave any one to judge, whether we are to understand from these words, that Christ *Consecrated* the Loaves and the Fishes, or whether He only gave thanks and praise to God over

E

them,

them, and beg'd a blessing upon them. And if This be call'd a *Consecration*, we may as well be said to *Consecrate* every Meal we eat as we ought, that is with Grace over it. If you would have the Authority of an Antient Writer in confirmation of what I have been saying, I shall produce the Testimony of *Oecumenius*, who in handling that Passage of *St. Paul*, on which you build so much, (*1 Cor. 10. 16.*) τὸ ποτήριον ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, explains it thus, ὃ εὐλογούντες κατασκευάζομεν, *quod cum laude & gratiarum actione adornamus*, which we prepare, by giving Praises and Thanks to God. If this be all you mean by Consecration, I readily grant it to you. But if you mean any thing else, I must desire better Proof for it, than you have hitherto brought from the New Testament, and from thence only I shall expect or acknowledge it. I know how far this Doctrine of Consecration has been carried, and of what use it has been toward advancing the Interest and Dominion of a certain Order in the Church of *Rome*, but I hope we have done with this *mysterious Magick*; and I shall always Pray, in the words of our Author, 'That all Those who have departed from the Corruptions of Popery, may depart entirely

‘tirely from the Spirit of it. (*Pag.* 234. of the Devotions.)

As to This Consecration’s being necessarily to be perform’d by a *Priest*.—I would ask you whether you are sure, you can prove, that at the time when *St. Paul* wrote This Epistle to his followers, there were any Priests and Ministers ordain’d and appointed in the Church of *Corinth*. A Learned Divine, of our own Communion, is of Opinion, That there were Not : And it seems strange, if there were, that the Apostle should not address himself particularly to them, and reprove them, for permitting such Indecencies to be committed at the Celebration of the Lord’s Supper. And now Sir, if you please, you may use me, as you have done our Author, and call me a Disciple of *Tindal’s*. I know not whether This be His way of Thinking on this Subject, but if it be, I must tell you, I would no more reject a Truth, because it comes from a Heretick, than I would embrace a Falseness because it comes from a Doctor of the Church of *England*.

Let it be observ’d, that all that is here said is not meant to oppose the *Propriety* or *Expediency* of this Rite of Consecration,

but only the *Necessity* of it. The Holy Eucharist may be more Solemnly and Decently perform'd by this Ceremony, but it would nevertheless be compleat without it. It may perhaps be objected to our Author, that He has in this Point *oppos'd the General Sentiments of Mankind*: Which may be imputed to *Pride* and *Self-Conceit*. But I can not but think that there may be as much *Pride* in adhering to establish'd Notions, as in departing from them. There appears to me to be more *Self-Conceit* in thinking ourselves always in the *Right*, than in Acknowledging both ourselves and our Fore-fathers to have been sometimes in the *Wrong*. The Authority of Great Names, Whether Antient or Modern can have but little Weight in a Church, Which is founded upon the Right of private Judgment, and which acknowledges the Scripture *Alone* to be the Standard of Truth, the Rule of Controversy, and the Measure by which all her Doctrines are to be tried. However to shew that Our Author is not *Alone* in his Sentiments on This point, I shall produce the Words of one of the Ablest Divines that the *Church of England* could ever boast of; Who had as much Learning, and perhaps a better, because

because a more Unbyass'd, Judgment, than most of His Cotemporaries; and who wrote with a Freedom, the more to be admired, because the less practic'd in the Age wherein he liv'd. The Author I am speaking of is the *ever Memorable Mr. Hales*—Who in his discourse on the Lord's Supper, after having spoke on the fond Errors of Christians in relation to this Rite of Consecration, says p. 62.

' To sum up therefore what we have to
' say on This Point, The Calling upon
' the Words of Consecration in the Eu-
' charist is too weakly founded to be made
' Argumentative. For the Action is per-
' fect, whether these words be used or for-
' born: And in truth to speak my Opinion,
' I see no great harm could ensue were they
' quite omitted. Certainly thus much
' good would follow, that some part
' (though not a little one) of the Super-
' stition that adheres to that Action, by
' reason of an ungrounded Conceit of the
' Necessity and Force of the words in it,
' would forthwith fall away. And having
mention'd This Great Man, I can not
help observing the Exact Agreement in
many particulars betwixt Him and our
Author, on the Doctrine of the Sacra-
ment. I shall give you in a few words
this

this Author's opinion on this important Point— 'to settle you therefore (says he) 'in your Judgment both of the thing itself, and of the true use of it, I will 'commend to your Consideration these 'few Propositions.

'*First*, in the Communion there is 'Nothing given but Bread and Wine.

'*Secondly*, The Bread and Wine are 'signs indeed, but not of any thing there 'exhibited, but of something given long 'since, even of Christ given for us on 'the Cross.

'*Thirdly*, *Jesus Christ* is eaten at the 'Communion Table in no sense, neither '*Spiritually*, by Virtue of any thing done 'there, nor really, neither Metaphorically nor Literally, indeed that which 'is eaten (I mean the Bread) is called 'Christ by a Metaphor, but it is eaten 'truly and properly.

'*Fourthly*, The Spiritual eating of Christ 'is common to all places as well as the 'Lord's Table.

'*Fifthly*, The *Uses* and *Ends* of the 'Lord's Supper can be *No more*, than '*such* as are mentioned in the *Scriptures*. 'And They are First, the *Commemoration* 'of the Death and Passion of the Son of God, specified by *Himself*, at the Institution

‘tution of the Ceremony. Secondly, to
 ‘testify our Union with Christ, and Com-
 ‘munion with one another, which End
 ‘St. *Paul* has taught us.

‘In these few Conclusions the Whole
 ‘Doctrine and Use of the Lord’s Supper
 ‘is fully set down, and whoso leadeth you
 ‘*beyond This* doth but *abuse* you. *Quic-*
 ‘*quid ultra Queritur non Intelligitur*. Thus
 far This Incomparable Author, Who, as
 ‘the Learned Bishop *Pearson* observes—
 ‘was a Most Prodigious Example of an
 ‘Acute and Piercing Wit, of a Vast and
 ‘Unlimited Knowledge, and of a severe
 ‘and profound Judgment. Let any one
 judge how far these Propositions agree
 with our Author’s on this Subject.

But I return to examine the Remarks
 made upon them.

The Remarker for the Two or Three
 next Pages puts on the Air of a Critick,
 but Talks and Cavils much more like a
 Country School-Master. However I
 must follow Him—but first I would ob-
 serve, that if He could prove his Point
viz. That *et tunc* was in this place an Adverb
 of *Time* and not of *Similitude*, He would
 be very far from proving his Second
 Charge against our Author, *viz.* that He
 had denied the Duty of a Self-Examina-
 tion

tion before the Lord's Supper. For our Author has expressly said at p. 65, where he is Contending for a different sense of This Word, 'That by *This* He would 'not insinuate that the Examination here 'recommended, was not design'd to go before the partaking of the Lord's Supper, 'for it is evident it was, Nor does this Interpretation imply it any more than the 'Common one. He only thinks that the following Verse is not so well connected, to what goes before, by taking the word in one Sense as in the other. Our Author indeed does not suppose it Necessary for a Man to make such an Inquisition upon his Conscience, every time he receives the Sacrament, as shall be the Labour of many Hours; And this I believe is what even our Remarker does not think Himself oblig'd to Practice. The whole Dispute therefore is, Whether the Word *ὅταν* be to be consider'd in This place as a Similar or a Temporal Adverb. That it is properly an Adverb of *Similitude*, and signifies *ita* or *ad hunc modum*, can not be doubted; Whether it may not sometimes, and in some Authors be taken for *tunc* or *tum demum*, I shall not enquire. All that I shall say is, that St. *Paul*, who uses this word above Twenty times in this Epistle,

Epistle uses it as a *Similar* and not as a *Temporal* Adverb, in this Sense He uses it before in this very Chapter, and never, as I know of, in any other throughout the whole Epistle. For when He mentions *Then* as an Article of Time, He constantly uses the Word *τὸτε*. I could confirm This by Instances, but surely This is enough upon so Trifling a Point on which so little depends, tho' it should be clear'd up by ever so many Quotations.

Your Third charge against our Author was, that He had denied that there were *Any* Benefits accruing to us from the *Actual* receiving of the Sacrament, p. 58. by Actual here I hope you mean *Worthy* receiving, otherwise you must subscribe at once to the *Opus Operatum* of the Papists.—This is indeed a Heavy charge, as it makes the Holy Sacrament entirely useless, and consequently teaches Men a total Neglect of it, You cannot but know that our Author speaking upon the *Benefits* of this Sacrament, Has declar'd that it is a *Mean* of *leading Christians to a steady Perseverance in all that is good* (p. 146.) an End, which is of itself Sufficient to make This Institution Worthy the Author of it. He has observ'd further, that we are to expect from a due

use of it, *In General, All that Favour, Acceptance, and Good Pleasure of Almighty God, which He has promis'd and annex'd to our Obedience to This as to all other of His Institutions.* (p. 153.) and *in Particular,* those *Privileges and Benefits* which are in the *Nature* of the *thing* itself implied in this Rite, or result from it (p. 154.) *viz.* the *Bettering our Lives and the Reforming our Morals,* which is the very *End of Religion* itself. It was His Intent to guard only against those *Fancied Privileges,* and *Fallacious Impressions,* Which are the Food and Support of *Enthusiasm* and *Superstition.* How then Sir do you support your charge against Him, of his having denied that *Any* Benefits are to be receiv'd from a worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper? In the most Shameful and Fallacious manner, by observing, that he has denied that *All* the Benefits of Christ's Body Broken and of His Blood shed, that is of his Death and Passion are Communicated to us at our worthy partaking of the Sacrament. This indeed He has oppos'd, as a very *Dangerous Error* in Religion, by which the Reward promis'd to the faithful observation of the *Whole* of Religion, is annex'd to one *Particular* part of it: and has shewn plainly, what
little

little Foundation there is, for such an Opinion, from the only Passage of Scripture which is brought in support of it. You endeavour to defend this Notion from that place, where *the Cup of Blessing which we bless is said to be the Communion of the Blood of Christ, as the Bread is of His Body*: And wonder that our Author should doubt of, or deny it. The only Argument of our Author's, against this Notion, that you take Notice of, is the Interpretation, which he puts upon the word *κοινωνία*. but it may be said there is no occasion for any Criticism on This word, there are much Stronger Arguments against the Assertion you would maintain *viz.* The whole Tenour of the Gospel, which never puts the Salvation of Mankind upon their Compliance with any *one* Duty—And the plain meaning of the Apostle in this place.

Let us just compare our Author's Comment with yours; that we may see which is most agreeable to the Apostle's design, and way of Reasoning. St. Paul in this place is manifestly endeavouring to persuade the Corinthian Converts, from partaking with the Gentiles of Meats offer'd to Idols; according to our Author He tells them, that in the Communion they

partake of Bread and Wine in *Honour* of Christ, and in Remembrance of his Body broken and His Blood shed for them. *On this account* therefore he shews them how unfit it would be for them to partake with the Heathens of Meats offer'd in their Temples in Honour of their Idols, to perform the same Sort of Action in Honour of Christ and of False Gods, to drink the *Cup of the Lord and the Cup of Devils, to be partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils, v. 21.* But According to you, the Apostle's Argument stands thus: At the Communion you are made Partaker of All the Benefits of Christ's Body and Blood: and therefore What? therefore you ought not to partake of Meats offer'd in Honour of Idols. How is this Argument adapted any more to *this* Crime, than *any other*? You Allow, that he makes no Comparison betwixt the Benefits receiv'd in the Eucharist, and the Benefits accruing to those who eat of the Sacrifice offer'd to Idols, and for this plain reason, because the Apostle knew of *none* and could acknowledge *none*. But you say that the *New and half-converted* Corinthians might *suppose*, and *believe*, that *some* Benefits might accrue to them, from eating of the Heathen

then

then Sacrifices. This is certainly a very weak and uncertain way of arguing; and I know not by what Authority you fix so impious and absurd a Notion upon Those whom the Apostle calls *τῆς κλήσεως, ἁγίης, ἱεροσυνελεύσεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. 'tis highly probable and might be shewn from other parts of this Epistle, that the Corinthians comply'd with this Heathenish Practice, Not out of a sense of any Benefits accruing to them from it, but merely for fear of Persecution, and St. Paul himself seems to clear them from any such conceit in that place where he says, *What say I then? that the Idol is any thing, or that which is offer'd to an Idol is any thing?* He there seems to argue *ex confesso*, and to take it for granted that the Corinthians themselves who partook of the offerings to Idols, did not expect any Benefit from them.

Upon the whole therefore I leave it to any one to Judge which is the best Exposition on this Passage, which is most agreeable to the design of the Apostle, and the *Analogy*, on which the whole Argument is built. Whether According to our Author's Exposition there be not a plain Connexion throughout the whole Argument, and whether there be even the

the Appearance of it in the other ; and Consequently whether our Author or his Adversary be the Ablest Expofitor of Scripture. From hence we may fee how Insufficient our Remarker's Endeavours have been to defend a point, which if He could have fupported, would have been far from proving his Charge againft our Author : for furely there is a great and Material Difference betwixt denying that *All* the Benefits of Chrift's Paffion are partaken of, or receiv'd in the Eucharift, and denying that there are *Any*. The first our Author has *denied*, and if the Gospel be true, He is in the Right, the other is Calumny, Falfely and I think I may fay Wilfully, fix'd upon Him by the Remarker.

Your next Objection to Him, is that *He has denied the Lord's Supper to be an Actual Covenant.* p. 66. This you think contrary to Scripture, and endeavour to prove it to be *fo* from *Heb. 10. 29.* ' of
' how much forer punishment fuppofe ye,
' fhall he be thought worthy, who hath
' trodden under Foot the Son of God, and
' hath counted the *Blood of the Covenant*
' wherewith He was fainted, an Unholy
' Thing. And now Sir, let me ask you, if you do really think that this place has
the

the least relation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, if you do, You are an unfit Person to set up for a Teacher of Mankind, for 'tis manifest you do not understand one of the plainest passages in Scripture. It is as clear as words can make it, that the Author of this Epistle is speaking in this place of a total Apostacy from Christianity, and warning his Disciples against it by the most terrible Argument, by telling them that if after having *receiv'd the Knowledge of the Truth, they should Sin willfully*, in this Respect, *viz.* by forsaking Christianity through fear or any other worldly Motive, *there remains No more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of Judgment and Fiery Indignation, for if He that despised Moses Law, perish'd without Mercy, of how much sorer Punishment shall He be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath accounted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith He was sanctify'd an Unholy thing.* — To apply This therefore to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is to take the most effectual means to deter Men from approaching to it, 'tis to teach them that if they are guilty of any Sin after having partaken of the Communion, they must necessarily and Irrecoverably be *Damn'd,*
'tis

'tis this Ignorant and Hazardous Application of Scripture, without considering the design or intent of the Writer and only just to serve a present purpose, That has frighten'd men out of their Senses, and made them dread the Lord's Table as they would the *last Tribunal*. It has taught them to remember their Master with Horror instead of Gratitude and Affection. But you will say 'tis plain from this passage, that there is a Covenant made in Christ's Blood. What Christian ever denied it? has not our Author asserted it in twenty places; and shewn that this Covenant was then made, ratify'd, and seal'd, when Christ was offer'd up for us on the Cross. But how can it be prov'd from the place you have produc'd, that the Sacrament is an Actual Covenant or even the Renewal of it: I think you might as well have attempted to prove from it the Duty of *Obedience to Superiors*, or the Necessity of *Infant Baptism*. I wish Sir you would consider, that a tolerable share of Knowledge in the Scriptures is quite Necessary for a Man before he sets up for a Christian Author. You seem indeed to be sensible of your own Weakness in this place, and to endeavour to puzzle your Reader, and lead him from the point you
are

are to prove; and I cannot but think Mr. *Newfashion* pays you a very Extraordinary Compliment, when He tells you He has found out *Whereabout you are*. p 69

The Remarker has hitherto, in a most Unchristian-like manner endeavour'd to shew that our Author is No *Christian*, He is come at last not to allow him to be even a *Sober and Conscientious Deist*. p. 70. The Occasion of his being so Angry with him is upon a mere matter of Ceremony, 'tis only whether some other posture be Necessary for us to receive the Sacrament in, than what is merely Decent at a common Meal. This he says our Author has denied, and for This he charges Him with having very little regard to the Honour and Worship of the Almighty. We are to observe that our Author here, is not speaking about what is *Decent* but what is *Necessary*; which are surely two things vastly different. There have been many and warm Disputes amongst Christians about the Posture, wherein the Holy Sacrament is to be receiv'd; our Author therefore has gone a great way towards *Accommodating* This Difference, by making no particular Posture *Necessary* to this Action; But this perhaps may be one Objection to him

G

with

with some Men, that he has not on this occasion Abused the Dissenters and call'd them Irreverent Slovens, that shew no Regard to the Body of our Lord. This has been the general way of treating them, which perhaps has made them less willing to comply with us in this Respect. Arguments may certainly be brought on *both* sides, either for Sitting, or Kneeling at the Eucharist, and therefore *neither* Side should be too Confident. 'Tis probable, that our Saviour did administer the Elements to his Disciples, *ἀνακείμενον αὐτοῖς*, whilst they Continu'd in the same posture, in which they were at Supper. But as our Church has directed us to receive the Sacrament Kneeling, and at the same time has declar'd, that She thereby designs no Adoration of any Corporal Presence of Christ in it, we have therefore good Reasons for complying with a Posture, which seems more Expressive of Devotion and Thankfulness for the Mercies we then receive. But let not this Argument be carried too far, I know what Fopperies have been brought into Religion, under Pretence of Decency, and perhaps Men can never be too much upon their guard against them. Our Remarker seems indeed to be Particularly
Affected

Affected with every thing that relates to the *Outside* of Religion, and has departed from the *Spirit* of Christianity, whilst he has been Contending for its *Dress*. But I would ask this Beau in Religion, which he thinks the greatest Fault,—to Preach up an Indifference to any Particular Posture at the time of receiving the Sacrament,—or to call a Man something *Worse than a Deist* for doing so.

Upon this Occasion we have the Authority of Dr. *Stillingsfleet* produc'd, but with Submission to so great and able a Writer, I would say, that most of the Instances He has given, relate not so much to *God and His Worship* as to *ourselves* and *one another*: 'if we go to Church in a more orderly Dress than we set in at Home—'tis not I Apprehend so much out of Respect to God Almighty as to our selves and the Congregation: for I can never think that God will regard whether I am in the Fashion or not, and that He will enquire, when I pray to Him, whether I do it in a clean Shirt or a dirty one. 'If we have the Psalms set to the Best Tunes—I suspect, it is more for the sake of the *Musick* than *Devotion*—and 'if our Bibles are Handsomely Bound—'tis because Mr. Church-Warden think's

they look Handsomer when they are so, they would nevertheless be the Word of God and the Book of Life. Yet these are the Points, about which weak Men are concern'd, and Passionate Men make so much Disturbance. How easily might a Rule be settled in these Respects, where Men had really the Spirit and Temper of the Gospel. Let *Decency* be observ'd, but let not *Charity* be transgress'd, for 'tis better for a Man to Pray all his Life time in a *Barn*, than to Quarrel with a Neighbour about an Ornament in a *Church*. On this Occasion give me leave to add those divine Lines of the Satyrst,

*Dicite, Pontifices, in Sancto quid facit Aurum?
Quin damus id Superis,
Compositum jus fasque animi, Sanctosq; recessus
Mentis, & incoctum generoso Pectus Honesto:
Hæc cedo, ut admoveam Templis, & Farre litabo.*

I have now done with the terrible Objections made by the Remarker to our Author's Book, of which I will venture to say there is not one, but what is founded either on his own mistake, or a manifest Misrepresentation of the Passages and Notions He pretends to examine and confute.

Our

Our Remarker has had such ill success with the Scripture, not having been able to support any one of his Assertions from it, that at last he seems willing to bring His Cause to another *Bar*, and try his Tenets by the Opinions of the *Fathers*. I shall not dispute with him his *Parallel Case* which he brings from the Law. p. 73. He who was so long at the Bar, must know the Practice of it better than I do. I shall only give some obvious Reasons, why the *Fathers* can not be the most proper *Judges* to determine the disputes which have risen in later Ages about the Doctrine of the Sacrament. Let it be consider'd that They wrote at a time, when there had been *no* Controversy in the Church about the Eucharist, They were not therefore so exact in their Language, or so guarded in their Expressions, as men are apt to be after a Controversy is once set on foot. The Chief Point that they Labour at is to give their Hearers a *Reverential Notion* of the Eucharist; Their Manner of discoursing on this Subject is generally *Sublime, Figurative, and Oratorical*. It is therefore no wonder if they should be guilty of some Expressions which if *Strictly* and *Literally* taken, will go a great way towards confirming and
Sup-

Supporting the Corruptions and Abuses of the Sacrament which were brought on in future Ages: and of which the Authors and Inventors always pretended to Shelter themselves under the Protection of the Fathers. To confirm this I might produce many passages out of those Antient Writers: but I shall content my self at present with alleging the Testimony of two very great Men to this Purpose. The First of them is Bishop *Cosins*, who in his *Histor. Transub.* p. 113. says expressly — ‘ Non Abnuimus nonnulla
 ‘ apud *Chrysostomum*, aliosque patres, inveniri, Quæ emphatico, immo vero
 ‘ Hyperbolicè de Eucharistiâ prolata sunt, & Quæ nisi dextre capiantur, Incutos Homines facile in Errores abducunt.

The other is that of *Hospinian*, a most exact and laborious Writer, who has collected every thing that can be said upon this subject in 2 Vol. in Folio. And he tells us (at p. 249. lib. 4. Vol. 1.) ‘ Confirmarunt etiam *Superstitiosorum*
 ‘ Hominum Sententiam Phrases Hyperbolicæ primitivæ Ecclesiæ Patrum, quibus Majestatem & Venerationem quandam huic Sacramento Conciliare voluerunt. Any one then may judge whether

ther the Fathers are the Propereſt perſons to appeal to in a diſpute about the real Nature of the Sacrament : I am ſure the particular Father you have produc'd, is a Writer highly improper on this Occaſion ; 'tis well known, that He liv'd in an Age, when Superſtition had taken great hold of the Church, and wrote in a moſt Figurative, and Oratorical manner. *Such* are the *Authors* with which the Roman Catholicks are beſt pleas'd, and apply moſt ſucceſsfully to their deſigns ; they take their *Boldeſt Figures*, and moſt *Rhetorical Flights*, in a *Strict* and *Literal* ſenſe, and then apply them, as they do the Scripture in Support of Contradiſtion and Nonſence. Of this fort I take that *Rhapsody* to be, which you have given us out of *St Chryſoſtom* where we are told, that when we receive the Sacrament, ' we ' are to become *Eagles* to fly up into Heaven,—to open the Heaven of Heavens, ' and ſee the Lord of Angels, and Arch- ' angels, and all the World; nay not only ' to ſee Him, but to handle Him, to Eat ' Him, and to bring *Him away* with us.

But pray Sir let me ask You, how You come to quote *St. Chryſoſtom* out of *Bingham's Antiquities*? I have a particular Reason for wiſhing that you had conſulted the

the Original. Had you look'd into the Edition of His works by *Fronto Ducaus*, you would have found that *Jesuit* as fond of this Homily, out of which you have given us some Extracts, as You are Yourself. For he has mark'd it in several places of the Margin—with *Euge, Chrysostome,—Euge,—Euge,—O Rare Chrysostom! Well Done! Well Done! This is to our purpose Exactly as we would have it.* (*Paris. Edit. 1636.* And yet Sir This is the Writer you are for applying to, for a *perfect* Knowledge of the Nature of the Sacrament, This is the *Cordial* which you say, we must take after an *Unwholsome Banquet* upon our Author. I must own, Sir, 'tis too *strong* for my *Head*, and seems fitted only for the *Palate* of a celebrated and Right Reverend Writer of our Church, who in his Discourse on the Sacrament, talks much of *Celestial Inebriation* and being *Drunk with the Holy Ghost*.

This is the sort of Language, which has been address'd to the *Weak* and the *Ignorant*: It may serve as far as I know, to *warm* their *Hearts*, but I am satisfied it has *confounded* their *Understandings*: and I am perswaded, that there is nothing so unlikely to give the Common sort of People a Right Notion of the Sacrament,

as the Books, that are generally put into their Hands, to *instruct* and *prepare* them for it. But I may perhaps take *Another* opportunity, to enter more largely into this Argument, and to shew how vastly some of our Divines have been mistaken in their Notions, and Positions, which they have deliver'd about the Doctrine of the Sacrament. My Business has been hitherto entirely with you, my design was to enquire into all that you have advanc'd against our Author; I have had occasion to say but little upon the main Doctrine of His Book, what you have Objected to the Positions laid down, or pretended to be laid down by him concerning the Sacrament, is by much the least part of your Performance; The rest consists of false Aspersions, Abusive Reflections, and Uncharitable Inductions, not so much from our Author's words as your *own*—I have therefore examin'd you *thoroughly*.—Where you have offer'd at *Reason* I have demonstrated that you have *None*.—Where you have pretended to *Wit*, I have shewn that it is *Scurrility* and *Prophaneness*. Might I flatter myself that what I have said will have any good Effect upon you—that you would take to your self a share of that pretty Modesty,

H

which

which in the Last Paragraph you give to your Antagonist—that you would retire as he does, with—*I Blush—I was very much to blame—I am Confounded.*

I have now done with the Remarker. But I am yet to make an Apology for myself, for having meddled with Him at all, I know 'tis the Opinion of Sensible People, that such a Writer should have been neglected, and pass'd over without any Notice.—But the Case is plainly This: a Gentleman of the Highest Station, and the Greatest Character in Our Church, has been traduc'd and vilified as a Man without Knowledge, Judgment, Sincerity, or Religion; He has been *implicitly* call'd a Block-head, a Knave, and an Infidel. This has been done by One, who is—What I have shewn Him to be.

It has been done in so *light* and *ludicrous* a manner, as is likely to affect even the Subject of the Debate, and to expose the Sacrament itself to Contempt.—It has been *Publickly* done in a *Place*, where *Youth* are to receive their first Impressions, Consequently where Any Ridicule may be Dangerous, and such Early Prejudices may be fix'd, as may be of very ill Consequence in future Life. And shall No Indignation be shewn against so much Insolence?

lence? Shall Such a Writer escape without any Notice? *Boys* may perhaps imagine he has Wit, and *Prejudic'd Persons* that he has Reason; there can therefore be *No Harm*, in spending a few *Idle Hours* on so *Idle* an Author, in shewing him to the World in his proper Colours, and painting him as he really is. The Holy Action which he has Ridicul'd, and the Author he has Abus'd, make him worthy of some Notice and Correction. As he now appears to us, The *Serious* Part of the University must be highly *offended* with the light and trifling manner in which he has treated the most Solemn Act of Religion, in his *first* Dialogue. All who call themselves Gentlemen and Christians, will be Shock'd at the Abusiveness of the *Second*; and they who pretend to be Scholars, will be as much displeas'd with the Ignorance and false Reasoning, so Apparent in the *Last*. Some things have been *incidentally* said, Which may in some measure tend towards explaining the Doctrine under Debate, if but little has been said on it, 'tis because I have been oblig'd to pursue a Writer, whose business it has been to lead us from the Main Point of the Controversy.

As to the *Manner* in which I have treated this Writer, I declare my self really concern'd at the Necessity of using it. I am sensible of the Moderation, the Decency and the Temper due to All, who differ as Gentlemen and Christians from Us—I lament the Acrimony and Bitterness with which Religious Controversy is too often conducted. But in this Case the Crime is to be Charg'd entirely on the Aggressor. There is no way of Answering the *Ignorant* and *Abusive*, but by shewing they *are so*. I hope that the Correction which has been bestow'd on this Writer, may prevent others from being guilty of the same Fault, and I sincerely wish, that if This Controversy on the Nature of the Lord's Supper is to be continued, it may be carried on with all that Decency which so much becomes Divines, and be Concluded, with answering the design with which, I dare say it was Begun, by clearing the Doctrine from the Difficulties and Darkeness in which it has been involv'd, by informing Men's Minds and Consciences in a more Perfect Knowledge of one of the most Important Points of Religion.

OXFORD, August 28th, 1735.

ve
ly
t.
e-
no
m
er-
is
de
he
er-
by
he
on
pe-
in-
rly
is
on
be-
ith
are
oct-
nefs
rm-
n a
the